

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated June 9, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. In response, Claims 1 and 7-9 have been amended. The amendment does not add new matter. In view of the amendment and/or for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,148 to Estrada et al. ("Estrada"), U.S. Patent No. 6,772,195 to Hatlelid et al. ("Hatlelid"), U.S. Patent No. 6,446,112 to Bunney et al. ("Bunney"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,496,851 to Morris et al. ("Morris"). The claim rejections are further supported by mIRC Version Notes taken from <http://www.mirc.co.uk/versions.txt> ("mIRC Version Notes"). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Regarding Claims 1 and 7-9, the Office Action states that Estrada discloses a placing means for placing the list of predetermined spatial locations stored in the storage means in a predetermined user space in the virtual space in response to an instruction from the first user. See Office Action dated June 9, 2008, page 2, line 22 - page 3, line 2. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert Estrada discloses place creation. For example, a place is created by copying the room type and the member directory for that place into a database. See Estrada, column 18, lines 14-22. However, Estrada does not teach placing a list within the newly created room. Thus, the place creation of Estrada fails to disclose or suggest a placing means for placing the list of predetermine spatial locations and, instead, discloses a means for creating a place.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully disagree that Estrada discloses storing a list of spatial locations. See Office Action dated June 9, 2008, page 2, lines 14-16. Instead, Estrada discloses "because of the growth of the Internet, collaboration using web technologies has been attempted, primarily using electronic mail (E-mail), Internet chat rooms, electronic whiteboards, and conferencing software." See, Estrada, column 1, lines 56-60. Estrada discloses different collaboration techniques that can be used but does not disclose storing different collaboration

techniques arranged in a list. Thus, Estrada fails to disclose or suggest storing a list of spatial locations as is claimed and fully supported by the specification.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree that Estrada discloses the list of predetermined spatial locations is designated by the first user. See Office Action dated June 9, 2008, page 2, lines 21-22. Because Estrada fails to disclose storing a list of spatial locations, Applicants respectfully assert Estrada cannot possibly disclose the list of predetermined spatial locations is designated by the first user.

To further clarify that Estrada fails to disclose the list of predetermined spatial locations, Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein other users are able to use the list of predetermined spatial locations.” Claims 7-9 contain similar amendments.

The amendment is fully supported by the specification. For example, applicants disclose “other users can be allowed to use the spatial location list.” See published specification, paragraph [0087] and Fig. 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest “other users are able to use the list of predetermined spatial locations.” For example, Estrada discloses “[e]ach room has its own security; that is, the identity of each user allowed to enter the room.” Therefore, Estrada discloses multiple users are allowed to use or enter the room. However, the list of predetermined spatial locations is not a room, rather something placed within a room by the first user. See published specification, paragraph [0091]. Thus, Estrada fails to disclose or suggest other users are able to use the list of predetermined spatial locations as is claimed and fully supported by the specification.

Applicants respectfully assert that Hatlelid, Bunney, and Morris fail to cure the deficiencies of Estrada discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejections with respect to Claims 1 and 7-9 and Claims 2, 5, and 10-13 that depend thereon be reconsidered and the rejections withdrawn.

For the forgoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of the same.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 112857-300 on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Cust. No. 29175

Dated: September 3, 2008